



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bloch for the continuance of the special form of peace propaganda in which he had been engaged.

The Baroness von Suttner renewed the invitation given last year at Glasgow by the Austrian Peace Society that the Congress in 1903 be held at Vienna. The invitation was unanimously accepted with thanks, and the date of the Congress fixed for next spring.

The Congress then closed, after adopting by unanimous vote the following Appeal to the Nations, which had been prepared by the Secretary of the International Peace Bureau, Mr. Ducommun:

Appeal of the Peace Congress to the Nations.

"Since the outbreak of the South African War and the war in the Philippines and the occurrence of cruel events in Armenia, this is now the third time that, in closing their annual Congress, the Peace Societies address to the peoples an appeal asking them to restore, without further delay, international concord. For three years an odious struggle has called forth universal reprobation. Are the efforts of those who wish to substitute for the reign of force the reign of law less justified thereby? On the contrary, we do not think so. Never, moreover, has the revolt of the human conscience been so strikingly manifested as to-day against that collective murder, war, that penalty of death inflicted without process of law on a large number of innocent people. Never has the fundamental principle of the law of nations as well as of private law been less contested; namely, that one cannot take the law into one's own hands, and that the reestablishment of a disputed right must come from a judge.

"The sad events of the present time do not then discourage us: they only render still more evident the necessity of the task that we have imposed on ourselves, but for the success of which the help of all good and benevolent men is indispensable to us. We see, and the whole world sees with us, brute force powerless to settle the questions raised in South Africa, and the English armies held in check by a small nation, determined to defend its imprescriptible and inalienable right to dispose of itself as it may choose. It is the bankruptcy of war: to which we oppose peace, a peace to be organized in such a manner that every international dispute may be settled normally and in conformity with law.

"The present Congress, at which delegates belonging to twenty-two different countries have been present, has pointed out precisely, by applying them to existing cases, the principles of future international law, which shall one day cover with its ægis the human family restored to its destinies of peace, justice and well-being. To-day no one any longer contests that the well-being of the laboring masses should be the chief objective of all civilized governments. It is, moreover, also incontestable that the social question is above all an international question.

"Never will the misery of the masses of the people be lessened so long as actual anarchy and the excessive militarism, which is the consequence of it, last. But the nations do not believe that they can disarm, because they imagine that the antagonism of their interests cannot be overcome. That is an immense error which it is of importance to remove. There is no antagonism between the real interests of nations, but only between

what seem to be such. If, then, there could be agreement between what really is and what seems to be their interest, the federation of humanity might take place immediately.

"The primary interest of every individual, as of every nation, is security to work, and in order to do away with want the peoples must be assured that no invasion of a neighbor will come and destroy in a few days the fruits of long years of painful and intense labor. Security, then, is the good most indispensable to all. It would be established immediately in a positive manner if the peoples did not imagine—a chimerical notion—that it is possible for them to ensure their own security without respecting that of others. Next to security, the most important interest of individuals and peoples is to enjoy completely the fruit of their toil. For that they must have the liberty to buy and sell what is necessary in all countries of the world, without restriction. The complete freedom of markets is the most imperative of all needs. It is a mistake to suppose that it is possible for a nation to export a product without another nation importing that same product at the same moment. To wish to make use of the universal market without universal free trade is likewise an error. The well-being of each nation is impossible without the well-being of all nations. Not only is there no antagonism between the real interests of nations, but, on the contrary, there is among them the completest solidarity.

"It is under a deep feeling of this truth that the Eleventh Universal Peace Congress makes its appeal to the goodwill of all, both individuals and nations. The human conscience is awakened. War is already forever morally condemned. There remains the duty of rendering it impossible by means of preventive international institutions. Peace is to make the circuit of the globe. Let us with all our power facilitate its march by removing every obstacle which might impede its progress.

"We invite the coöperation of all men of right sentiments and purposes, whose faces are turned toward a future of light, and not toward the dark past marked with blood and desolation."

The Responsibility for the Philippine War.

From Senator Hoar's speech in the United States Senate on May 22.

The senator from Ohio, in his very brilliant and forcible speech, which I heard with delight and instruction, said that we were bound to restore order in the Philippine Islands, and we cannot leave them until that should be done. He said we were bound to keep the faith we pledged to Spain in the treaty, and that we were bound, before we left, to see that secured. He said we were bound, especially, to look out for the safety of the Filipinos who had been our friends, and that we could not, in honor, depart until that should be made secure.

All that, Mr. President, is true. So far as I know, no man has doubted it. But these things are not what we are fighting for; not one of them. There never was a time when, if we had declared that we only were there to keep faith with Spain, and that we only were there to restore order, that we were only there to see that no

friend of ours should suffer at the hands of any enemy of ours, that the war would not have ended in that moment.

You are fighting for sovereignty. You are fighting for the principle of eternal dominion over that people, and that is the only question in issue in the conflict. We said in the case of Cuba that she had a right to be free and independent. We affirmed in the Teller resolution, I think without a negative voice, that we would not invade that right, and would not meddle with her territory or anything that belonged to her. That declaration was a declaration of peace as well as of righteousness; and we made the treaty, so far as concerned Cuba, and conducted the war, and have conducted ourselves ever since, on the theory that we had no right to interfere with her independence; that we had no right to her territory or to anything that was Cuba's. So we only demanded in the treaty that Spain should hereafter let her alone. If you had done to Cuba as you have done to the Philippines, who had exactly the same right you would be at this moment, in Cuba, just where Spain was when she excited the indignation of the civilized world and we compelled her to let go. And if you had done in the Philippines as you did in Cuba, you would be to-day, or would soon be, in those islands, as you are in Cuba.

But you made a totally different declaration about the Philippine Islands. You undertook in the treaty to acquire sovereignty over them for yourself, which that people denied. You declared not only in the treaty, but in many public utterances in this chamber and elsewhere, that you had a right to buy sovereignty with money, or to treat it as the spoils of war or the booty of battle. The moment you made that declaration the Filipino people gave you notice that they treated it as a declaration of war. So your generals reported, and so Aguinaldo expressly declared. The President sent out an order to take forcible possession by military power of those islands. General Otis tried to suppress it, but it leaked out at Iloilo through General Miller. General Otis tried to suppress it and substitute that they should have all the rights of the most favored provinces. He stated that he did that because he knew the proclamation would bring on war. And the next day Aguinaldo covered the walls of Manila with a proclamation stating what President McKinley had done, and saying that, if that were persisted in, he and his people would fight, and General MacArthur testified that Aguinaldo represented the entire people. So you deliberately made up the issue for a fight for dominion on one side and a fight for liberty on the other.

Then, when you had ratified the treaty, you voted down the resolution in the Senate, known as the Bacon resolution, declaring the right of that people to independence, and you passed the McEnery resolution, which declared that you meant to dispose of those islands as should be for the interest of the United States. That was the origin of the war, if it be war. That is what the war is all about, if it be war; and it is idle for my brilliant and ingenious friend from Ohio to undertake to divert this issue to a contest on our part to enable us to keep faith with our friends among the Filipinos, or to restore order there, or to carry out the provisions of the treaty with Spain.

Now, Mr. President, when you determined to resort to force for that purpose you took upon yourself every natural consequence of that condition. The natural result of a conflict of arms between a people coming out of subjection and a highly civilized people—one weak and the other strong, with all the powers and resources of civilization—is inevitably, as everybody knows, that there will be cruelty on one side and retaliation by cruelty on the other. You knew it even before it happened as well as you know it now that it has happened, and the responsibility is yours.

If, in a conflict between a people fighting for independence and liberty, being a weak people, and a people striving to deprive them of their independence and liberty, being a strong people always, if the nature of man remains unchanged, the war is converted in the end into a conflict in which bushwhacking, treachery, and cruelty have to be encountered. The responsibility is with the men who made the war. Conflicts between white races and brown races or red races or black races, between superior races and inferior races, are always cruel on both sides, and the men who decree with full notice that such conflict shall take place are the men on whom the responsibility rests. When Aguinaldo said he did not desire the conflict to go on, and that it went on against his wish, he was told by our general that he would not parley with him without total submission. My friend from Wisconsin declared in the Senate that we would have no talk with men with arms in their hands, whether we were right or wrong. The responsibility of everything that has happened since, which he must have foreseen if he knew anything of history and human nature, rests upon him and the men who acted with him.

We cannot get rid of this one fact, we cannot escape it, and we cannot flinch from it. You chose war instead of peace. You chose force instead of conciliation, with full notice that everything that has happened since would happen as a consequence of your decision. Had you made a declaration to Aguinaldo that you would respect their title to independence, and that all you desired was order and to fulfil the treaty and to protect your friends, you would have disarmed that people in a moment. I believe there never has been a time since when a like declaration made by this chamber alone, but certainly made by this chamber and the other House, with the approval of the President, would not have ended this conflict and prevented all these horrors.

Instead of that, gentlemen talked of the wealth of the Philippine Islands and about the advantage to our trade. They sought to dazzle our eyes with nuggets of other men's gold. Senators declared in the Senate Chamber and on the hustings that the flag never shall be hauled down in the Philippine Islands, and those of you who think otherwise keep silent and enter no disclaimer. The senator from Ohio says our policy has not been in the dark, but it has been a policy published to the world. Has it? Has it? I want to ask, What was it which created the war, which keeps it up, and which created and keeps up the hatred, and will make war break out again and again for centuries to come, unless human nature be changed or be different in their bosoms from what it is in ours? It is because you keep a padlock on your lips.